

Fall 12-1-1999

Senate Meeting, December 1, 1999

Academic Senate
Illinois State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/senateminutes>



Part of the [Higher Education Administration Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Senate, Academic, "Senate Meeting, December 1, 1999" (1999). *Academic Senate Minutes*. 805.
<https://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/senateminutes/805>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Academic Senate at ISU ReD: Research and eData. It has been accepted for inclusion in Academic Senate Minutes by an authorized administrator of ISU ReD: Research and eData. For more information, please contact ISUReD@ilstu.edu.

ACADEMIC SENATE AGENDA
TIME: 7 P.M., Wednesday, December 1, 1999
PLACE: OLD MAIN ROOM, BONE STUDENT CENTER

Call to Order

Roll Call

Approval of Minutes of 11/10/99

Chairperson's Remarks

Vice Chairperson's Remarks

Student Government Association President's Remarks

Administrators' Remarks

Committee Reports

Action Items:

10.29.99.02 Honorary Degree Committee Selection (Rules & Student Affairs Committees)

Information Items:

10.21.99.01 Applied Computer Science Major and Minor Proposal (Academic Affairs and Budget Committees)

08.09.99.01 University Curriculum Committee Proposal - Revised (Academic Affairs and Rules Committees)

Adjournment

Meetings of the Academic Senate are open to members of the University community. Persons attending the meeting participate in discussion with the consent of the Senate. Persons desiring to bring items to the attention of the Senate may do so by contacting any member of the Senate.

If you no longer have use for your interoffice mailing envelopes, please return them to the Senate office (mail code 1830) or return them at each meeting.

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES
(Approved)

December 1, 1999

Volume XXXI, No. 7

Call to Order

Chairperson Curt White called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Roll Call

Secretary Barbara Kurtz called the roll and declared a quorum.

Approval of Minutes of November 10, 1999:

Motion XXXI-64: by Senator Weber (seconded by Senator Noyes) to approve the minutes of November 10, 1999.

Corrections to Minutes: Senator Schwartz stated that Professor Emerson Wiens spoke at the last meeting regarding the Industrial Technology proposal. The minutes inaccurately reflected that Dean Rossman was the speaker. Minutes with corrections approved unanimously.

Chairperson's Remarks:

Senator White: Encouraged all Senate members to attend the Senate meeting on December 15 due to the action item (UCC proposal) to be considered.

Vice Chairperson's Remarks:

Senator Knox: Stated that this would be his last Senate meeting as Vice Chairperson. He thanked both Senator White, for all of his advice on Senate issues, and Senate secretary, Cynthia James, for her assistance as well. Student senators will vote for a new Vice Chairperson after tonight's meeting.

Student Government Association President's Remarks: No remarks.

Administrators' Remarks

- **President Boschini:** Honorary Degree Recipients. Last year we voted to award two degrees, one to Judith Ivey and the other to Gwendolyn Brooks. Judith Ivey will be here to accept her Honorary Degree on Founders Day, February 17, 2000. A recipient must be present to accept an Honorary Degree. Gwendolyn Brooks is unavailable to come to ISU to accept this degree due to a previous commitment.

A two-day Board of Trustees retreat was held in Chicago in November. It was a very good retreat and there was some very good discussion. After the retreat, Board members are not allowed legally to do any business per the open meeting laws. However, members had several issues that they still wanted to address, and therefore, will hold a special telephone meeting on Friday, December 17, 1999. The Board will discuss the Capital Campaign and the term of office of the Chairperson of the Board. The meeting will be held at 3:00 p.m. in Hovey 419. President Boschini encouraged everyone to attend.

- **Provost Goldfarb:** No remarks.
- **Vice President for Student Affairs:** No remarks.
- **Vice President for Business and Finance**
Senator Bragg: The IBHE will mail budget recommendations to us on Friday. Senator Bragg stated that he would forward copies to the Budget Committee for discussion.

Some Senate members have also asked about the pension bills. As of 9:00 a.m. this morning, there was a pension bill introduced into the General Assembly that contained some provisions that address the Mattis case. Senator Bragg stated that he would inform the Senate as to whether or not the bill was passed.

Committee Reports:

Academic Affairs Committee

Senator Schwartz: Academic Affairs met on November 17 and discussed the support for students involved in university activities, the Constitution exam, and the Senate Chairperson's challenge to the committee to develop an annual university colloquium. The committee met this evening to discuss the Applied Computer Science proposal. The committee has also spent many meetings discussing the University Curriculum Committee proposal, which will be an information item at this evening's meeting

Administrative Affairs Committee: No report.

Budget Committee: No report.

Faculty Affairs Committee:

Senator Kurtz: The committee met tonight to discuss the Service Awards and will meet after the Senate meeting to finalize recommendations. One additional application was received after the initial application deadline.

Rules Committee:

Senator Newgren: The Rules Committee met tonight and discussed the UCC proposal and the faculty nomination for the Honorary Degree Committee. The committee also discussed shared governance issues.

Senator White: The Governance Task Force is now in the process of seeking input from various constituencies on campus. The Rules Committee will meet with members of the Task Force in the near future and then with the Senate as a whole. The committee will then forward its recommendations to the Task Force after its meeting with the Senate. This is an extremely weighty issue and unfortunately we also have a time limit of March 1, which is when the report must go to the President.

Student Affairs Committee:

Senator Gillespie: The Student Affairs Committee discussed the proposal for the renewal of the Academic Progress Alert system. They also discussed the Honorary Degree Committee elections and talked briefly about a letter from Professor Jesse concerning the Phish concert. The committee will meet again at 6:30 p.m. before the next Senate meeting to continue its discussion.

Action Items:

10.29.99.02 Honorary Degree Committee Selection

Senate Faculty Member:

Motion XXXI-65: Senator Newgren: The Honorary Degree Committee requires one faculty representative member from the Senate; the Rules Committee nominated Senator Dave Weber. Motion approved unanimously.

Senate Student Member:

Senator Knox: Two student senators, Ryan Gillespie and Steve Whitmore, have expressed interest in participating on this committee. The Senate voted by ballot and elected Steve Whitmore as the Senate student representative.

Student Government Association Nomination:

Motion XXXI-66: Senator Ford nominated Nicole Griffin to the Honorary Degree Committee. Motion approved unanimously.

Information Items:

10.21.99.01 Applied Computer Science Major and Minor Proposal

Senator Schwartz: Invited Professor Robert Zant, Chairperson of the Applied Computer Science Department, to speak about the proposal. The proposal is basically to make an existing sequence in Information Systems into a full major and minor. The proposal does not require new courses or new funding.

Senator Razaki: Asked Prof. Zant if he foresaw any problem in the future for other units or departments to also develop programs or sequences like this.

Prof. Zant: No, our department has recently supported the new program put forth in Fine Arts for Arts Technology. We will also support a program coming forward from the College of Education in Instructional Technology and we have supported other new programs in the past as well.

Senator Schmaltz: Asked how the program would be expanded, as indicated in the proposal.

Prof. Zant: We really won't see an expansion in the number of students in the program. We have a fairly large program now. The actual quest is for repackaging. We believe that at a degree level, we will have the opportunity to offer our students more options. Under this proposal, we would have a B.S. in Information Systems and we would have still the B.S. in Applied Computer Science. The telecommunications degree is also a separate degree.

Academic Senate

Hovey 208

438-8735

Web Address: <http://wolf.its.ilstu.edu/AcademicSenate>

acsenate@ilstu.edu

Academic Senate Meeting

December 1, 1999

Motion XXXI-67: by Senator Schmaltz, second by Dicker, to move this information item to action. Motion approved unanimously.

Motion XXXI-68: by Senator Schmaltz to approve the Applied Computer Science Department's proposal for a major and minor in Information Systems. Motion seconded by Senator Razaki. Senator Razaki expressed his complete approval of the proposal. The motion was approved unanimously.

08.09.99.01 University Curriculum Committee Guideline Revisions

Senator Schwartz: Academic Affairs and Rules Committees have discussed the University Curriculum Committee (UCC) proposal, which would shorten the process for approval of courses by the UCC and by the Senate. The approval process currently involves quite a number of committee reviews. Academic Affairs has proposed that the Senate approve the UCC recommendations with the amendment that program proposals go to the Executive Committee of the Senate, which basically would serve as a screening group. Proposals that the Executive Committee determined had need of more review would be forwarded to Academic Affairs and then to the Senate as a whole.

Senator Razaki: How is the rest of the university community going to be informed about new academic proposals, especially the students?

Prof. Horvath, UCC Senate Liaison: Any new course proposal has to be circulated within the university to every department chairperson and to every curriculum committee. The UCC is of the opinion that departments and colleges are really in a better position to evaluate these courses than even the UCC or the Senate. We recognize the fact that all not colleges and departments have students on their curriculum committees. That is why we, along with the Rules and Academic Affairs Committees, want to encourage departments and colleges to include students on their curriculum committees.

Senator Razaki: Is it going to be mandated that students should start serving as soon as this goes into effect at departmental and college levels? Sometimes in the Senate, there are questions raised by student senators who don't belong to those departments, so how will other parts of the student body be informed if the Senate students are no longer involved in the process?

Senator Goldfarb: Students sit on the Executive Committee. If they see problems, they could raise those questions within the Executive Committee.

Prof. Horvath: The UCC does not have the authority to require curriculum committees to include students. As I understand it, the Senate has that authority because you review their bylaws. So in effect, it would be up to the Senate to mandate that students sit on those on committees.

Senator Newgren: In two years this process will be reviewed. Who will review it?

Prof. Horvath: It is the assumption of the UCC that the Academic Affairs Committee will review it. If we find out that some other levels of scrutiny are required, you may want to revise the process again.

Senator Newgren: The proposal should state specifically that it will be reviewed by the Senate as a whole in two years.

Prof. Horvath: We would be happy to change the language if that is the consensus of the Senate.

Senator Newgren: Will the Executive Committee develop procedures that will be communicative in nature in the process of determining whether or not a proposal comes to the Senate?

Senator White: It is important that some type of communication sheet be developed to go with the proposals from the UCC to the Executive Committee. One of the questions on such a form would be what was the nature of debate within the UCC regarding a proposal.

Senator Newgren: Is the Executive Committee going to develop procedures or benchmarks that indicate a proposal should be referred to the Senate?

Senator White: First we should have some type of communication to indicate the nature of debate. Also anything having to do with General Education programmatically would come to the Senate. In fact, I would be more comfortable if it were stated explicitly in the revision of point B that anything that has to do with programmatic changes from General Education comes to the Senate.

Prof. Horvath: The UCC does not have jurisdiction over programmatic changes in General Education. Such programmatic changes would never come from the UCC. The only thing that the UCC would ever do that has anything to do with General Education is approve a General Education course after the Council on Teacher Education (CTE) had approved it.

Senator Campbell: Applauded any effort to cut down on the amount of time that is consumed by faculty at all levels in this process of curriculum review.

Senator McCaw: We keep saying that we need to streamline this process, but are there examples of proposals that have come through that have not met the deadlines to be included in the catalog because they have been held up in the Academic Senate?

Prof. Horvath: There were at least two last year and there very likely is one that you will have to deal with on December 15th.

Senator Reid: Who would decide whether the SGA should be included in the circulation of these proposals?

Prof. Horvath: The SGA is included in the circulation currently.

Senator Reid: How would the committees that we are talking about encourage student involvement, in what manner would you encourage it and to whom?

Prof. Horvath: Again, we can't require student membership on the curriculum committees; the Senate would have to do so. With the Sense of the Senate, our encouragement would have more of an impact.

Academic Senate

Hovey 208

438-8735

Web Address: <http://wolf.its.ilstu.edu/AcademicSenate>

acsenate@ilstu.edu

Academic Senate Meeting

December 1, 1999

Senator Schmaltz: How is the Academic Planning Committee involved in the process?

Senator Goldfarb: Departments signal to Academic Planning Committee early on that they intend to submit new program proposals. So, the Academic Planning Committee is informed about a new program proposal before it even gets to the UCC.

Senator Schmaltz: Has the Academic Affairs Committee considered "ownership" in deciding the Academic Senate's role in the approval process?

Senator Schwartz: Yes, we are letting go of some of this ownership, but it is to the greater good--getting these programs approved more quickly, streamlining the process.

Senator Brown: There is a lot of student involvement on the Senate and we are cutting that out if we are no longer involved in this process. If we approve this proposal, how would we remedy the issue of student involvement?

Prof. Horvath: Students who are best able to participate in the curriculum process are the students closest to the curricular issue at hand. While we may be eliminating students at the Senate level, we are asking students to be involved in the development of curriculum at the department and college levels.

Senator Weber: Would these proposals be in the hands of the Executive Committee for a sufficient amount of time so that they would be able to review them carefully prior to coming to the meeting?

Senator White: Usually we get the material Thursday or Friday before the Monday meeting so that is not sufficient time to do justice to some of these programs. It is always possible of course for the Executive Committee to review something in two sessions. This does not help with the timeline issue, however.

Senator Weber: Would it be reasonable to consider also posting proposals on the Senate web site so that other members of the Senate and members of the University community would be able to have access to them?

Senator White: Agreed that this was a very good idea. The Executive Committee will develop a protocol for exactly how it will deal with program proposals. We will have that ready by the meeting on December 15th.

Senator Ford: Students on a local level would understand their college or their department proposal better. However, what happens when the issue is General Education courses?

Prof. Horvath: If it is a course housed within a department and it is a General Education course, then there should be students involved in it the review process at the department level and at the college levels via the Departmental Curriculum Committee and the College Curriculum Committee. The course proposal would then go to the CGE (Council on General Education), where there is again student involvement. So there are at least three places where students would have input on General Education courses.

Academic Senate
Hovey 208
438-8735

Academic Senate Meeting
December 1, 1999

Web Address: <http://wolf.its.ilstu.edu/AcademicSenate>
acsenate@ilstu.edu

Senator Strickland: The UCC will review new and revised course proposals if they are part of a new program. How do you see the UCC reviewing those individual courses differently than they review them now?

Prof. Horvath: I don't see any difference. The way courses are reviewed now is that we get a technical report from Norma Stumbo and Jon Rosenthal, who consult with other administrators. Then two faculty members are assigned who redo all of that work. They then report to the UCC their findings, which then votes whether or not to approve a proposal.

Senator Strickland: Why have you chosen to review the courses that come with new programs if you are not reviewing other new courses?

Prof. Horvath: The difference is that the new course is part of a new program or a program revision and in order to evaluate the program, you have to evaluate the courses that are part of that program.

Senator Strickland: Of the courses that the UCC reviews, what percentage comes unassociated with a new program? If you are reviewing courses that are part of new programs, how much of this are you actually streamlining?

Prof. Horvath: Probably less than 20% would be new courses within a new program. The vast majority of what we do is revisions of existing courses.

Senator El-Zanati: Since this is an undergraduate issue, why is the Graduate Curriculum Committee reviewing it?

Prof. Horvath: Because of the 300 level course issue. A course may count for both a student's masters and undergraduate degrees. All of that requires the joint action of the UCC and the GCC.

Senator Whitmore: Has the UCC considered that given the involvement of the students on UCC being so low and that the participation at the local levels also is low, this proposal may void any student voice entirely?

Prof. Horvath: Evidence shows that that is not the case. In the College of Arts and Sciences, the students are an integral part of the curriculum committee. In the few departments that I know of that involve students, it is also a very successful process.

Senator Walker: When would this go into effect if we approve this?

Senator White: I would prefer that it began with the seating of the new Senate for continuity. The Parliamentarian, however, has informed me that it would go into effect immediately unless we specify otherwise. I think we should bring it back to the Senate at the next meeting with a specific time.

Communications:

Senator Gillespie: On behalf of the student senators, we wish lots of luck to Vice Chairperson Knox in his student teaching and thank him for doing an excellent job as Vice Chairperson. The Senate applauded Senator Knox' service on the Senate.

MotionXXXI-69: by Senator Weber, second by Senator Moomey, to adjourn. Motion approved by standing vote.



Microsoft Excel
Worksheet

Academic Senate
Hovey 208
438-8735

Web Address: <http://wolf.its.ilstu.edu/AcademicSenate>
acsenate@ilstu.edu

Academic Senate Meeting
December 1, 1999

December 1, 1999

Date: 12/1/99							
		Approval of Minutes	Faculty Election to Honorary Deg. Com.	SGA Election to Honorary Deg. Com.	Move to Action ACS Prop.	Approval of ACS Prop.	To Adjourn
Names	ATTENDANCE	Motion 64	Motion 65	Motion 66	Motion 67	Motion 68	Motion 69
		Unanimous	Unanimous	Unanimous	Unanimous	Unanimous	Unanimous
Andrade	EXCUSED						
Bell	X						
Boschini	X						
Boyer	X						
Bragg	X						
Brown	X						
Campbell, Mary	X						
Campbell, Sara	EXCUSED						
Chang	X						
Crothers	X						
Day	X						
Dicker	X						
El-Zanati	X						
Ford	X						
Gillespie	X						
Goldfarb	X						
Goodwin	X						
Graba	ABSENT						
Horvat	EXCUSED						
Knox	X						
Kurtz	X						
Lemaster	X						
McCaw	X						
Meier	EXCUSED						
Moomey	X						
Morgan	X						
Newgren	X						
Noyes	X						
Olejarz	X						
Otsuka	X						
Panfilio	X						
Razaki	X						
Reid	X						
Schmaltz	X						
Schwartz	X						
Semlak	X						
Spaude	X						
Strickland	X						
Thomas	X						
Timmerman							
-Lugg	X						
Van Draska	X						
Walker	X						
Waple	X						
Weber	X						
Wells	X						
Wennerstrom	X						
White	X						
Whitmore	X						
Wight	X						
Williams	X						
Wolf	EXCUSED						
Zielinski	EXCUSED						